

HEW



MTIPAT.185A

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	:	Leman, et al.)	Group Art Unit 2635
)	
Appl. No.	:	09/574,736)	
)	
Filed	:	May 18, 2000)	
)	
For	:	REMOTE COMPUTER)	
		CONTROLLER AND)	
		CONTROL METHOD)	
)	
Examiner	:	Vernal U. Brown)	
)	

RESPONSE

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action, dated March 28, 2005, Applicant has the following amendments and remarks.

Discussion of Examiner Interview begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 3 of this paper.

Appl. No. : **09/574,736**
Filed : **May 18, 2000**

DISCUSSION OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicant's attorney wishes to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of conducting a telephonic interview for this application on May 9, 2005. During this interview, the Applicant and the Examiner discussed areas of concerns relating to the removal of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,300 to Jung as a prior art reference. Specifically, the discussion was directed towards providing additional documentary evidence supporting conception that was earlier than the date of the prior art reference; providing declarations pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 from the inventors or providing reasons why such declarations could not be obtained; and showing diligence on the part of the attorney who prepared and filed the application.

Applicant submits that the information and documents provided in this Response fulfills the issues raised in the discussion. Included is a declaration pursuant to § 1.131 from the attorney who prepared and filed the application provides documentary evidence to support conception at a date earlier than the prior art reference and shows diligence on his part in pursuing the application. Additionally, the evidence of conception at a date earlier than the prior art reference is further supported by the § 1.131 declaration by Michael V. Leman, one of the two inventors. Declarations are also made by Peter Sun and Sheila Deschenes, employees at Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP, who diligently attempted, but were ultimately unable, to contact William Creese, the other named inventor to obtain a § 1.131 declaration from him.